DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 227 UD 029 867

AUTHOR McCain-Reid, Evelyn
TITLE Seeds of Change: A Pilot Study of Senior Pre-Service Teachers' Responses to Issues of Diversity in One University Course.
PUB DATE Sep 94
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Change; *College Seniors; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; Disabilities; *Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; Knowledge Level; *Multicultural Education; Pilot Projects; Preservice Teacher Education; Racial Differences; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

A pilot study was undertaken to determine the impact that two models of instruction had on students' learning. The two models: the Societal Curriculum/School Curriculum Model (SCSCM) and the Multicultural Education Infusion Method (MEIM) were incorporated into a preservice teacher-education course. Subjects were 16 white females and 4 white males, with an African American female professor as the principal investigator. Prevailing attitudes of these students toward multicultural education and their subjective responses to information about issues of race, class, gender, and disability were determined. Students were asked to keep journals, to prepare a paper on their philosophies of education, to critique their journals, to have an interview with the professor, and to complete a teaching demonstration and its evaluation. Students generally possessed and demonstrated low levels of sophistication and experience regarding human diversity. As the course and the study progressed, students appeared to understand the concept of multicultural education but also to have difficulty incorporating its themes into their assignments. Positive changes in attitudes did begin to occur, which suggests the usefulness of the approach. (Contains 24 references. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED376227

Seeds of Change: A Pilot Study of Senior Pre-Service Teachers' Responses to Issues of Diversity in One University Course"

Evelyn McCain-Reid, Ph.D., Assistant Professor Of Curriculum and Instruction, Ohio University

Introduction

This paper describes a pilot study undertaken to determine the impact that two models of instruction, the Societal Curriculum/School Curriculum Model (SCSCM) and a Multicultural Education Infusion Method (MEIM), incorporated into one preservice teacher education course, had on students' learning. The Societal Curriculum/School Curriculum Model (Cortes, 1976) was used to assess pre-service teachers knowledge and sensitivity to human diversity. The SCSC model was also used to make teachers aware that individuals and groups in our society are constantly and intimately engaged in a "hegemonic" learning process, where messages about human diversity are subtly absorbed both from society and schools and often go unquestioned. Although this knowledge may support our understanding of who we are and our connection to others, this information may also serve to miseducate. The Multicultural Education Infusion Method (Simms, 1986), draws upon the Cortes model by incorporating interdisciplinary concepts (formal classroom curriculum knowledge) with controversial issues from society (societal curriculum knowledge), with the hope that understanding and sensitivity to group struggles would occur and a positive attitude would develop (Bennett, Niggle, & Stage, 1990).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E. McCain-Reid
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The study was conducted at a small, predominantly white state institution in Ohio. Twenty senior secondary preservice teachers in the process of completing the last course in their educational sequence participated in the study. The study invovled sixteen White females and four White males, and an African American female professor who served as the principal investigator. Though the study sample is small and the absence of minority preservice student teachers is apparent, the situation is fairly typical of predominantly White institutions; and therefore, promises to shed light on the issues and challenges encountered by educators in focusing on issues of human diversity in their education curriculum .

As has been noted by numerous other authors in this volume, a multicultural approach to education and issues surrounding human diversity promises to be among the most challenging educational issues of the 21st century. We know from American history and housing patterns that generally White Americans have not consistently and intimately lived in and interacted within minority communities. Thus, their knowledge of minority children is limited. It appears then, that if we expect our future teachers who are mostly White, female, and middle class, to effectively educate minority students (i.e., develop an awareness and sensitivity to the issues and concerns that impact minority students' daily lives), we as teacher educators must challenge our students to critically analyze commonly held views concerning American minority groups. According to recent research (Banks and Banks, 1989; Grant and Sleeter, 1985; 1986; 1987; Gollnick and Chinn, 1986), we must also encourage them to become sensitive to the natural differences that occur as a result of different ethnic backgrounds, religions, socio-economic levels, native languages, mental

abilities, etc., and we must help them design curricula that responsibly addresses and connects issues of race, class, gender, and disability.

Theoretical Framework

Multicultural education researchers have greatly contributed to our knowledge and understanding about human diversity in American society, and how messages about human diversity are communicated through policies, practices, and procedures that connect American society and schools. Mainstream America has historically dominated and controlled information about human diversity in society and schools, and thus the knowledge about diverse groups that is brought into the classroom by teachers and students is often limited and narrow, thus, misrepresented.

Multicultural education research explores why some groups (i.e., White, middle class, male) have historically dominated resources, in a capitalist democractic society such as ours. Based on this inequity, what messages are communicated to preservice teachers about youth from different ethnic, racial, social class, and disability groups, and how do these messages bias their conceptions of youth? Because our teaching pool is primarily White female and their knowledge about human diversity has been shaped by limited, narrow, and often negative messages from mainstream society, teacher educators must develop curriculum and teaching methods that benefit a diverse group of students. Teacher educators must also develop curriculum and teaching methods that enhance the quality of knowledge brought to the classroom by pre-service teachers about diverse groups, by eliminating negative messages and enhancing positive ones. Multicultural theory cautions that we all lose

when these social prejudices filter into schools through institutional policies and practices.

According to Cortes, our ideas about diversity are influenced by the messages we receive from society: family and friends, the community, organizations, mass media, records and videos, and personal interactions with others. Societal messages influence individuals on local, national, and worldwide levels, and affect one's self-image and understanding or misunderstanding about others--even one's vision about the nation and the world, and hopes for the future. Such messages can become a part of the School Curriculum when they are brought to and communicated in the classroom by administrative practices, teachers, and students. For instance, teachers may be guided by their biases from society as they choose educational materials to use with diverse groups of students.

Teachers must, therefore, provide classroom activities that expand students' knowledge about others. One way to help students understand others is to encourage them to develop relationships with persons different from themselves, maintain ongoing friendships with those persons, and to interact with diverse groups in different settings. This will enable students to observe how issues may impact people's lives differently in situations.

The Societal Curriculum/School Curriculum Model (SCSCM) creates this cultural sensitivity in teachers by challenging their views about human diversity. Following this model, students keep an ongoing journal about diversity around campus and in the community, then teach a lesson based on what they observed.

The classroom may serve as a place where teachers can provide more opportunities for students to develop their understanding of diversity. The Multicultural Education Infusion Method (MEIM) introduces

controversial issues from society into the curriculum, by asking students to write position papers comparing their philosophy of teaching to their ideas about diversity. As students reflect on their views about diversity, they critically analyze their teaching method, challenging themselves to consider where their values come from, and how they fit in the classroom.

The MEIM Model extends the SCSCM Model by incorporating information about diversity from society into the curriculum and classroom activities in order to challenge students' knowledge about diversity. Students learn to approach educational topics from the perspectives of diverse groups.

The course incorporated these two models, and challenged students to examine their ideas about diversity in society and schools. Classroom activities constantly challenged students to explain their views about human diversity, and to justify their teaching approach. Furthermore, students were asked to share their experiences as they learned to teach more effectively to a diverse group of students.

Review of Literature

A limited number of research studies exist on Multicultural Education and preservice training (Baker, 1973; 1977; Bennett, 1979; Grant, 1981; Hennington, 1981; Mahan, 1982), with information focusing mainly on statistical methods and data. However, a small number of articles and books exist on the issue of human diversity and the growing need to incorporate multicultural issues as a central focus in the classroom. A particularly useful source is Grant and Sleeter's *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender* .

The Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education offers possible reasons for teacher educators' neglect of human rights and minority group issues at the core of curriculum:

> ...Unfortunately, teacher educators have not always been conscious exemplars of human rights. Few actively advocate the rights of minority groups or promote cultural pluralism. Today, leaders ask the education profession to develop in students those attitudes and beliefs which support cultural pluralism as a positive social force. Thus, the education of teacher educators must be substantive enough to develop a respect for the culture, lifestyles, and contributions of non-mainstream cultures. Teacher educators also need a commitment to universal human values in order to promote harmonious coexistence. (pp. 108-109)

Grant and Koskela (1986) argue that the call for incorporation of ideas about human diversity into university coursework has gone largely unanswered. Dawson (1981) echoes Grant and Koskela, comparing the attitudes of teacher education faculty at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and at predominantly White universities. According to Dawson, numerous teacher educators at HBCUs believe that their commitment to minorities (as evidenced by working at HBCUs) is sufficient proof of their involvement in multicultural education. Likewise, many teacher educators at traditionally White universities believe that their work in monocultural and monosocial geographical regions exempt them from any obligation to commit time to multicultural education. Dawson views

these attitudes as "erroneous and typifies the exemption syndrome" (p. 5), with university curricula reflecting "business as usual" education, or the implicit acceptance of segregated American education and/or education that excludes the lifestyles, values, and customs of minority groups.

In the mid-70s such accrediting agencies as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) joined the multicultural education reform movement, attempting to make teacher educators and program designers more responsive to human diversity. Their goal was to establish multicultural education criteria by which to assess teacher education programs and course curricula--criteria which would be an "on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society" (NCATE Preamble, Multicultural Standard 2.1.1). The NCATE standard further appealed to teacher educators and administrators to show a commitment to Multicultural Education by placing multicultural ideas at the core of university curricula and by discouraging separate multicultural courses:

> ". . . Multicultural education presumes an acceptance of and commitment to cultural pluralism for all teachers and administrators. . . it is not a body of subject matter to be easily packaged in separate courses and learning experiences that are added to the teacher education program in a laissez-faire manner."

Like the NCATE framers, Sims (1983) also discourages programs that incorporate multicultural education by adding additional hours to

teacher certification programs or by offering multicultural elective courses. Instead, the writer challenged university administrators and teacher educators to incorporate the Multicultural Education Infusion Method (MEIM), which incorporates issues of diversity at the core of curricula and challenges preservice teachers' commonly held views. According to Sims, MEIM produces effective teachers competent in all traditional skills and more--"more" being a knowledge and understanding of the traditions, attitudes, and customs that shape the behaviors of culturally diverse people. To Sims, the MEIM approach establishes a curriculum fabric with "strands of multicultural education interwoven so closely that they are a part of the whole, and also a component of each separate part" (Sims, p. 43).

The Study

As the preceding review of literature suggests, much has been written on the need for incorporating issues of human diversity in the classroom, but little research has been done on the actual incorporation of Multicultural Education as a central focus of study or on the implications arising from its implementation. Also, the research that *has* been undertaken relies mostly on statistical methods and data, and as a result, does not provide a qualitative portrait of how students actually think about diversity. Therefore, this pilot study was undertaken with the following goals: 1) to determine the prevailing attitudes of preservice teacher educators toward multicultural issues ; 2) to elicit their subjective responses to information about issues of race, class, gender, and disability; 3) to establish how this information influenced their attitudes toward teaching.

Method

The study was undertaken in a ten-week senior-level social cultural foundations course,"Teacher, School and Society," which enrolled 20 students.

The students were initially introduced to the ideas of human diversity through Grant and Sleeter's five approaches, and the course was conducted in a lecture/discussion format, focusing on assigned readings that would challenge and inform students on issues of race, class, gender, and disability as they relate to educational issues. The readings were chosen for their potential to introduce controversial topics, raising such questions as, which groups were barred from the polls in the South during the post reconstruction period due to literacy test laws and why? How did these laws impact the lives of Blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians? How did Brown vs. Board of Education impact the lives of secondary education teachers and students? What was the impact of Lau vs. Nichols on secondary teachers and students in the San Francisco school system?

After working together to establish a definition of multicultural education as "educational policies and practices that recognize, appreciate, and affirm diversity in regard to ethnicity, gender, social class, and disability," students were asked to consider the five approaches introduced, along with the conventional "business as usual" approach, and then to complete six assignments that required them to establish their "ideal" future teaching situation (i.e., community, school staff, classroom comprising different race, class, gender, and disability, grade level K-12, subject matter) and that encouraged them to examine various multicultural issues in relation to that teaching situation. All assignments

were designed to elicit from students their knowledge and understanding of human diversity. Moreover, many of the assignments also incorporated the aspect of assessment or evaluation, for as Miller (1979; 1988; 1990) maintains, student evaluations of teaching materials and procedures, professors' content, and self evaluation is of critical importance to the learning process in a university setting. As he states, ". . . though more than one mode of assessment should be used, the single most important form of evaluation in university classrooms is that of students." (p 64)

The first assignment, the **Teacher Education Journal**, required that students respond in writing to issues of diversity as they arose out of daily experiences (e.g., observations from other courses, residence hall living, television, newspapers, previous public school experience, home, baseline criteria for the course) from the first day of the course through the last regular day of class. The second, the **Philosophy of Teaching Paper**, required students to critically analyze their views of teaching as a profession (e.g., "where did these ideas and values come from and how do they fit into the the classroom?). This analysis would also involve historical information that helped to shape teaching philosophies (e.g., such legal and social issues as desegregation and status group interest). The third, the **Professional Journal Critique**, required students to present a brief summary of a professional article, followed by a critique that incorporated baseline criteria and discussed implications for educators and/or teacher educators. The fourth, an **Interview with the Professor**, involved a 30-40-minute audiotaped interview which required students to respond to a combination of ten open-ended, probe, attribute, and contrast questions designed to challenge their currently-held views and assumptions, their approach to teaching, and their daily interactions with groups different

from themselves. The fifth, a **Microteaching Demonstration**, required students to submit a written plan--including a belief statement--outlining a specific lesson focusing on human diveristy and to teach the lesson using a Multicultural Education or Education that is Multicultural perspective. They were then asked to conduct the lesson with the professor and other class members using a role-play method and teaching to their "hypothetical" future class where diversity is present. And finally the sixth, the **Evaluation of the Microteaching Demonstration**, required each student to submit a written evaluation immediately following each student's demonstration.

These six assignments served as a tool for developing critical thinking skills for the students and also served as the source of information for the study. Though the information itself was subjective, as were the methods used to obtain it, the procedures approximate the actual classroom experience much more closely than do statistical methods and information, and as a result, offer a valid, but often overlooked, source of information for teacher educators.

Results

Results of the study are reported according to the six assignments that gave direction to the study.

Teacher Education Journals

All twenty group members responded to issues of race, class, gender, and disability in the teacher education journals. Several participants reported that they felt comfortable interacting with different racial groups and had longstanding and genuine relationships with minorities. However, others stated that they felt uncomfortable when interacting with different racial groups and that they strongly opposed T-shirt slogans that

expressed racial messages (such as "It's A Black Thang, You Wouldn't Understand"), some going so far as to suggest that racial messages on T-shirts should be banned or outlawed.

Many participants strongly opposed interracial dating and marriages and found it inappropriate behavior. Some respondents in this group reported that they came from small towns where their parents and community members (i.e., ministers, friends, community leaders) taught them that they should never interact closely with Blacks, Jews, and internationals; thus, interracial dating and marriage were out of the question to them. For example, one White male student first apologized to the professor who is African American, and then stated that he have never considered African American women as possible dates, he did not find them attractive, therefore, dating or marriage to African American's were impossible for him to consider. Several group members reported that their parents taught them to interact only with their own kind which was "Gods word," while others stated that they were "uncomfortable" and "frustrated" discussing issues raised in the course regarding race, class, gender, and disability. For example, one White female student expressed that she respects African Americans, Jews, and internationals as long as they live in "their "communities and did not attempt to live and interact in "her" neighborhood. She stated that she felt unsafe in the company of African American males and that she strongly believed that African American males were prone to crime which contributed to her discomfort.

However, as the course progressed, some of the sample members began to question friends who made racial jokes and labeled different ethnic groups in a negative way. Several participants reported that in the past they had participated in racial jokes and found it "fun," but because of

issues raised in this course, they began to take racial jokes more seriously. One member of this group reported addressing the issue of labeling and putting down people due to ethnic difference quite strongly with her roommate, who made the statement "Boy, Jews sure have a lot of money, don't they?" This respondent also reported overhearing a group of White males talking in the library who stated in a loud condescending voice within earshot of some Chinese students, "Boy this place looks like Chinatown on the weekend."

Some sample members also reported on social class differences in their journals. Many student responses demonstrated their lack of sensitivity toward human diversity and their lack of understanding about systemic economic oppression in a capitalistic society. Although many of them had begun to challenge biased statements made about minority groups in society, they failed to place these societal messages within institutional structures, particularly schools. One female described a telephone conversation with her brother-in-law where he made a statement that he was tired of his taxes going to pay for lazy minority and low income people who depend on social programs; when she pointed out to him that she was white and on social assistance, he offered no response. She expressed that she was unable to see how persons in our society who hold negative views of minorities would impact learning in the classroom. She further expressed that the Society Curriculum/School Curriculum and the Multicultural Infusion Model had little impact on her thinking. She wanted to see society function as it did in earlier periods in our history (i.e., prior to laws that allowed groups to mix and confused everyone), where groups in society were segregated, attended segregated schools, and

multicultural education (i.e., diverse groups of people interacting together and sharing similar views) was not of concern in schools.

Several respondents also reported that, in the past, they believed that street people and low income people on social programs were in those positions because they refused to work or because they wanted that quality of life, but recently they realized their thinking about low income individuals, derived mainly from print and electronic media, was unfounded. A number of students cited a change in their opinions, coming to a recognition that many street people have loving and caring families and money, and that other reasons may be responsible for their situation.

Several participants reported on issues of gender in their journals. Some of the males felt that women tended to contradict themselves on women's issues, as when some women expect males to open doors for them and others are absolutely insulted by the act. Some males commented on women who competed with them in the athletic weight lifting program; they asked the women,"Don't you know that the focus of men's strength is at the upper portion of their body and women's strength is at the lower portion of their bodies?" and the women replied, "So, what is your point?" Several females reported being opposed to affirmative action policies for women because these policies sometimes appeared to hurt men. They noted that while working in summer jobs they observed women who worked alongside men and were paid equally due to affirmative action policies, but often they noticed the male workers assisting women in lifting heavy objects. Other females reported that women around campus were ignorant of activities in support of women. They reported that when they participated in the "Take Back the Night" project, many of their roommates

and friends who are senior teacher education majors asked, "What is this 'Take Back the Night' thing?"

One sample member reported that he uncovered biases toward the disabled or differently able. He described opposing his peers who made fun of a friend's "little person" girlfriend. According to him, he learned from her that the preferred language of this group is "little people" rather than "dwarfs." He also reported learning that, in her view, the university imposes extreme limitations on little people and other differently able groups by not having elevators and access ramps installed in all buildings, by not installing telephones and other utilities within easy reach, and by having a complicated process for reporting and defending problems of lack of access.

Philosophy of Teaching Papers

As stated previously, this assignment asked students to offer an analysis of their hypothetical classroom and to describe their philosophy of teaching. They were challenged to read professional works such as Giroux', Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals, and Kanes', The First Year of Teaching; Grant and Sleeter's, After the School Bell Rings; Grant and Koskela's, "The Relationship Between Preservice and Campus Learning Experiences", prior to beginning this assignment. Respondents Teaching Philosophy responses fell into the following categories: those who saw teachers as: 1) facilitators of knowledge (the teacher should present only the course material as represented in the textbooks); 2) initiators of knowledge (the teacher should present ideas to students who would act on the knowledge based upon their background experiences); 3) motivators of knowledge (the teacher should motivate students to become independent

learners); and 4) leaders of knowledge (the teacher should guide students to gain knowledge).

A number of sample members saw themselves as facilitators of knowledge and reported that they had not given much thought to their philosophy of teaching (some had completed their student teaching and others were involved in student teaching at the time of the course). They described a facilitator of teaching as one who leads the discussion and takes it in a direction where the leader feels it important to refine students thinking on an issue. They saw themselves as facilitators of discussions in the classroom regardless of students' backgrounds.

Several participants viewed themselves as initiators of knowledge where the teacher uses the inquiry method to ask questions that trigger students to think about a topic in a different way. They reported that they had accumulated knowledge throughout the years which had empowered them; they were now aware of the power of knowledge and of the classroom as being a place where teachers are to transfer this knowledge or power to students regardless of race, class, gender, or disability status (however, they saw no differences in students' backgrounds or how these differences might affect students' ability to learn).

Several participants reported that they were motivators of knowledge whose role was to creatively and actively engage all students in classroom discussions of human diversity regardless of views of race, class, gender, and disability status and to engage them in a critique of modern society from these different group perspectives. However, they wanted to encourage students to resolve group differences and to understand others by recognizing laws that govern society and institutions.

And finally, some respondents reported that they were leaders in the classroom who saw their responsibility to students and society as being one of "taking up where parents left off," by teaching children to respect group differences. Their hope was to resolve conflict in a positive way by teaching an "acceptance of and respect for differences," bringing about a "group unity" which would eliminate group conflicts.

Professional Journal Critiques

In response to this assignment, which asked students to offer a brief summary of an article of their choosing from a professional journal of their choosing and to offer a critique discussing implications for educators and/or teacher educators. The group as a whole cited the need for professionals to show more sensitivity to issues of diversity in their writing. A number of students noted insensitivity to multicultural issues especially in English journals, noting that the majority of the articles were written by majority group members about majority and minority group students and therefore expressed an American white middle-class assimilationist attitude. They reported that when majority writers wrote about minorities, they failed to address cultural traditions and how teachers could address cultural differences in the classroom. One respondent compared two articles written about Hmong students, one written by a white and the other written by an Asian. According to the respondent, the white author showed no sensitivity to Asian culture, but instead expected Asian students to adapt to the white culture. In contrast, the Asian writer talked specifically about the need for greater sensitivity on the part of teachers and a greater awareness about cultural differences. The writer then went on to explain the common practice in the Hmong culture of socializing children not to

look directly at adults' faces and how this behavior could be misinterpreted by a teacher not familiar with the culture.

Another participant reported on an article where African American and Hispanic students were viewed as discipline problems in the classroom, but no attempt was made to understand their behavior in terms of African American or Hispanic traditions and culture, nor was any distinction made between Hispanics and other ethnic groups such as Mexican, Puerto Rican, or Cuban students.

Respondents reported that social class issues were unclear to them in professional writings. Some participants reported reading articles that briefly described social class differences as an economic concern. One participant discussed an article where the author emphasized the economic pressures placed on low-income families by their children's desire to dress like other students. The article then went on to say that school districts were attempting to remedy these financial pressures and deter gang activity in schools by implementing a uniform dress code for all students in their districts, but there was no discussion of how low, middle, and upper income parents responded to this policy.

Several participants reported reading articles about the "vanishing white male movement" and the "black male endangered species movement" that impressed them as both sexist and racist. According to respondents, both types of articles seemed to establish males as a separate group in need of "protection" and both argued against the other: according to white males, too much attention was being given by the schools to minorities, and according to black males, schools were overwhelmingly at fault for failing to educate black males.

Some students who were special education majors directly addressed issues of the disabled. They saw a need for regular education teachers to take more special education courses in order to understand and meet the needs of special education students in the classroom. They wanted to see these changes for teachers who work in mainstream settings with the disabled.

Interviews with the Researcher

The interviews with students were constructed around four basic types of questions designed to elicit information on students' views of race, class, gender, and disability. Grand tour or general questions were used around a topic to elicit general information, i.e., "Tell me what you think about children who are poor?" Probe questions were used to elicit components of a conceptual category, i.e., "You have described two categories of poor students, are there others?" Attribute questions were used to elicit description about a specific category, i.e., "What constitutes a wealthy student, a poor student?" And lastly, contrast questions were used to search for differences among related categories, i.e., "What differences do you see between a wealthy student and a poor student?"

All of the respondents talked about race, class, gender, and disability in their interviews. Several students reported that they felt very comfortable interacting with groups who are racially different, but that they had problems interacting with differently able groups. Some students reported that they had no friends outside of their racial group and that they were uncomfortable interacting with racially different groups whether invited or uninvited by a member or members of the group. A number of students

reported that they grew up in communities where they were taught in the home and in the community to interact with their own kind.

Several respondents reported that they felt uncomfortable interacting with low-income people who had "dirty clothes," "oily hair," or "body odors." Many students also reported that they felt extremely uncomfortable discussing the concerns of homosexuals and lesbians because they shared their families' and churches' disapproval of these groups, and they asked that discussions of the gay community be discontinued. Some respondents expressed the opinion that individuals with disabilities were unclean and should not be responsible for preparing or serving food in restaurants. One participant talked about going to a restaurant where a disabled person was uncontrollably salivating while serving food, and another talked about a person working in a restaurant who was spilling the food he was attempting to serve.

Microteaching Demonstrations

In response to being asked to demonstrate their understanding and commitment to Multicultural Education approaches (or Business as Usual approaches) by teaching a K-12 lesson, sample members designed and taught a 30-40 minute "lesson" to their "hypothetical" class that incorporated information about race, class, gender, and disability. Students reviewed Grant and Sleeter's five approaches to human diversity and were encouraged to use any one of the approaches in their demonstration.

Fifteen out of twenty participants demonstrated Human Relations strategies and how these strategies could be incorporated in their classrooms to raise the level of awareness of and appreciation for race,

class, gender, and disability. For example, one teacher passed around photos depicting males and females of different races, religions, and political orientations, as well as individuals with disabilities, and asked students to tell how they were similar to and different from persons in the photos. The teacher then summarized the lesson and explained that although we are alike and different from others, we must learn to appreciate and tolerate the differences.

Some respondents demonstrating Human Relations strategies focused on how group conflicts arise from group differences, stating that group conflict should be approached from a positive perspective in the competitive classroom setting. For example, one teacher offered written scenarios of situations in South Africa. Students were given scripts that placed them in particular roles (e.g., President Botha and other players in the South African government, Afrikans, and South African Whites) that created conflict. The teacher then summarized the exercise by questioning the students about the group differences and explained that although our external trappings are often different, inside we are the same and must live together in harmony.

A few respondents, since they viewed many veteran teachers as consciously and/or unconsciously encouraging negative messages and stereotypes about different groups, demonstrated Multicultural Education and Education that is Multicultural and Social Reconstructionist approaches to their microteaching demonstration. They wanted to engage their students in activities that recognized sensitivity to cultural pluralism and in projects that would bring about change in the American educational system. One student expressed the need for Americans to become sensitivie to multicultural issues in the United States and to take that mindset into

other countries as well. This participant argued that her lesson on America's need for cultural sensitivity in international marketing was Education that is Multicultural and Social Resconstructionist since it focused first on the need for cultural sensitivity at home in the United States prior to approaching global markets. For example, this teacher argued that this lesson called for sensitivity to human diversity in the U.S. prior to entering international markets, otherwise international marketing and problems with cultural and language translation would occur. The teacher explained that the Coca Cola company experienced difficulties marketing its product in China because Coca Cola in Chinese means "to bite the waxed tadpole." Likewise, Chevrolet experienced problems marketing the Nova in Spanish-speaking countries because Nova in Spanish means "it won't go." And finally, the Sunbeam mist stick curling iron was difficult to market in Germany because, translated into the German language, the name means "manure wand." This teacher then summarized the lesson by emphasizing the need for Americans to show cultural and language sensitivity on a global level.

Evaluations of Microteaching

All students were asked to evaluate one another's microteaching demonstrations and were encouraged to offer their opinions, views, and assessments regarding the multicultural issues raised by the demonstrations. Criteria for microteaching demonstrations were: the lessons were to teach to human diversity with their "hypothetical" diverse classroom setting in mind; they were to demonstrate their understanding and commitment to a Multicultural Education or Educaton that is Multcultural and Social Reconstructionist approach to teaching; they were

to consider the diversity in the classroom and explain how the lesson considered the diversity present. On the first day of class the professor and students defined multicultural education and agreed that it was necessary inorder to teach effectively in a diverse classroom setting.

Students' evaluations of the microteaching demonstrations fell into several general categories best expressed by the following statements: "were given a different view of the classroom," "were not so helpful," "helpful," "somewhat helpful," and "very helpful and challenging."

Several respondents evaluated the lessons as offering them a different view of how issues of race, class, gender, and disability can be incorporated into lessons in the classroom, and reported that their thinking had been challenged about a host of issues that might arise from presenting issues of diversity in a "mixed" classroom setting. They also learned about ways that they might deal with possible intense situations.

A number of respondents evaluated the lessons as "not so helpful" and stated that they had not been made aware of issues of human diversity in other classes in the teacher education program, but that they were now aware of this information and were comfortable with it.

Some participants evaluated the lessons as "helpful" in showing them how to incorporate issues of diversity in the classroom, and in familiarizing them with issues that had been unclear or unfamiliar to them at the beginning of the course.

One student evaluated the lessons as "somewhat helpful" in regard to thinking about how to include information about cultural and social differences and similarities in the classroom; she would now show more sensitivity to different student learning styles.

And finally, several students reported that, after completing the assignment, they had found the lessons "very helpful and challenging." But moreover, the most important thing to them was that they could better understand various teaching strategies that incorporated issues of diversity into the curriculum.

Discussion of Findings

Based upon the previous data, the findings of the study relating to students' prevailing attitudes regarding multicultural issues, as well as to their responses to information about those issues and the possible influence on their attitudes toward teaching, indicate three significant areas of concern: 1) The relatively low level of sophistication and experience that students possessed and demonstrated regarding issues of human diversity; 2) The students' consistent reliance on "Business as Usual" and Human Relations approaches in incorporating the ideas of multiculturalism into their own philosophies of teaching; and 3) The lack of previous classroom preparation--noted by the students themselves--designed to educate them on the relevance of human diversity and multicultural issues.

Level of Sophistication

Much of the data collected reflected a relatively low level of awareness on the part of the respondents about the issues of human diversity. Though several respondents reported personal friendships with minorities and others spoke of mutual tolerance, a majority of the sample initially demonstrated relatively unsophisticated and uninformed views concerning human diversity and multicultural issues, illustrated especially in the journals and interviews, where several students expressed opposition to

interracial dating and marriage, affirmative action policies that appeared to "hurt" males, the presence of differently able individuals in the workplace, and homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle worthy of discussion.

This information might need to be appreciated for what it implies. A number of studies have found that beliefs of youth and young adults are closely aligned to those of their parents (for example, Elkin and Westley, 1955; Hollingshead, 1949; Kandel and Lesser, 1972), which in the case of many majority parents, may range from full acceptance of racial mixing to refusal to allow a minority into the house (Grant and Sleeter, 1986). This data might also reflect the influence of students' community leaders, teachers, and professors whose responses to and presentations of information about minority groups were often omitted, neglected, or casually approached and presented in a negative or stereotypic light within conversations and discussions in the home and the classroom.

Particularly, public school and higher education curricula developed mostly by majority group members with limited and stereotypic notions of minority groups have in the past omitted or neglected minority concerns, or when those concerns were made part of classroom discussions, they were offered as alternatives subordinate to mainstream curricula ideas, rather than occupying an equally central position in the curriculum.

Also, respondents who felt uncomfortable discussing minority and differently able groups in open forums reported that they came from rural isolated areas where no minorities lived. Their only information about minority groups had come from television and hearsay. Others had been socialized in suburban communities with extremely limited interactions with minorities. This data, then, might reflect that a student's initial

resistance to, or discomfort with, issues of human diversity arises partially out of their lack of exposure to ethnically or culturally different populations (for instance, many of them had not, in their past, had a minority teacher or professor).

However, even more interesting to those involved in teacher education and teacher training was the data from the Philosophy of Teaching Papers, the Microteaching Demonstrations, and the Evaluations of Microteaching, which indicated that a majority of the students believed in using Human Relations and/or Business as Usual approaches in planning and conducting classes. The implications of this data are discussed in the next section.

Reliance on Business as Usual or Human Relations Approaches

The group of respondents in this study initially expressed a desire to affirm human diversity and agreed to place these issues central in their curriculum and thinking. Many strongly advocated Multicultural Education. However the data revealed that at times they felt uncomfortable discussing the concerns of some groups (i.e., gays and lesbians), and they failed to affirm human differences and to show how they would incorporate curricula content that seriously engaged their students in the change process. For instance, they reported that they would recognize and plan for issues of race, class, gender, and disability groups in all assignments by using Multicultural Education strategies, but the philosophy of teaching data showed that 100% of the sample reported that they viewed all students the same in the classroom (i.e., this data offered no recognition of human diversity), and fifteen of the twenty respondents, instead of adopting a multicultural approach in their microteaching demonstrations,

demonstrated Human Relations strategies for teaching diverse groups of students.

It appears then that, as the investigation progressed, though the group understood the concept of Multicultural Education, they experienced difficulty incorporating its themes into their assignments--which might account for the significant number that used Human Relations strategies. However, we must bear in mind Wesley's (1949) admonition that, even though Human Relations strategies may help to develop attitudes of tolerance, these strategies in the classroom do not address needed policy changes in regard to race, class, gender, and differently able groups in schools and in the broader social arena. Rather, Human Relations teaches people to "get along" with each other or to "create harmony between groups," as the students put it, suggesting that this approach to teaching ignores the need to confront the causes of conflict.

Lack of Previous Educational Background

It is relevant to acknowledge here that, prior to conducting this study, the principal investigator made some assumptions in regard to the participating respondents. They were students who, as seniors, had already completed an urban education component of the teacher education program, as well as a series of four human relations mini-courses attached to an introductory teaching course, and this was to be their final course in teacher preparation. It was assumed they would be drawing on both personal experience of minorities and from knowledge gained about minorities from their previous classes. It was also assumed that they had developed the conceptual sophistication to refocus and manipulate their prior knowledge and to integrate Multicultural Education ideas into their

current strategies. However, it became apparent that, along with this course being their first substantial introduction to multicultural issues, many of these students were unaccustomed to a participatory class format--they were used to being "told" what to do. They also were being challenged--many of them for the first time--to take ownership for their beliefs about volatile issues that their parents, American society, and institutional representatives have in the past ignored or stereotyped.

Many students themselves were concerned that Multicultural Education concepts had not been introduced much earlier in their education, and they pointed to a lack of consistent training regarding multicultural issues throughout their teacher education program. Though the program incorporates an urban education component (i.e., one course with an urban field experience) during the students' sophomore year and eight hours of human relations training to satisfy the NCATE multicultural mandate, these students failed to link the content of the Urban Education course with human relations sessions.

For those students who were interested in Multicultural Education, their main concern was about the amount of research that would be required of them as first-year teachers if they were to accept the challenge of teaching about the lifestyles, contributions, and accomplishments of culturally diverse and differently able populations.

However, the data collected also reflected several positive aspects in regard to the teaching and incorporation of Multicultural Education. Though several respondents indicated an initial resistance to ideas presented in the class, their ideas began to change as they were presented with more information. Several journal entries reported a move from

acceptance of the "status quo" (tolerating racial jokes or slurs based on ethnicity or social class) to a questioning of these behaviors and even the courage to confront peers on their attitudes and behavior.

Respondents also displayed a growing sensitivity and awareness in their Professional Journal Critiques, where they demonstrated remarkable critical skills in identifying the authors' different levels of multicultural awareness. Several respondents expressed the desire for additional information about various groups, especially on social class differences.

Though it's true that several group members were experiencing the "storming" process and communicated an unwillingness to accept Multicultural Education concepts, several others were beginning to work through their previously held biases about groups different from themselves and were seeking ways to include this information in their curricula.

Recommendations

Though the sample from this pilot study is small and care must be taken not to generalize too much about its findings, several recommendations can be tentatively drawn from the data presented. The students' level of sophistication and their own frustrations over the lack of exposure to multicultural issues in previous teaching courses suggest a definite need for the incorporation of a Multicultural Education approach in all teacher education curricula, beginning with introductory courses. As Grant (1981) has argued, one course of intensive instruction in EMC is insufficient to make a lasting impact on preservice teachers' views of classroom teaching. Therefore, issues of diversity must be centrally placed in all teacher education coursework in ways that challenge preservice teachers' views of minorities throughout their teacher education program.

At the same time, current teacher education courses should be carefully assessed for overlap so that the inclusion of Multicultural Education courses does not increase teacher certification hours unless necessary (more does not necessarily mean better).

The multicultural theoretical perspective that articulated the models used in this study and the resulting data obtained from a group of senior preservice teachers might also imply that those of us who assume responsibility for preparing future teachers to work in diverse classroom settings can no longer allow students' thinking about majority and minority groups to go unchallenged in our classrooms. Student responses to the professor's African Americaness and gender also indicates a need to challenge students thinking about human diversity in our society. These assignments were ungraded, thus, many participants felt comfortable to make biased statements about African Americans in the presence of an African American authority figure, their teacher. Students knowledge of human diversity and their negative opinions about African Americans is of concern to this researcher since in less than one year these teachers will teach African American youth. It may well indicate a need for teacher educators to assess our own knowledge about and sensitivity to minorities--a need to get involved in development workshops to assess our commitment to, and understanding of, Multicultural Education--for we who serve as role models for future teachers cannot fail in our attempts to accurately cultivate their thinking about American history and geography from a diverse group perspective.

And lastly, given the demographic changes in both teacher and student populations and the number of states that are now beginning to mandate preservice coursework in Multicultural Education, there needs to

be more research on its impact and additional recommendations made for strengthening such coursework. Martin (1991) found that in 1986 twenty-seven states required some form of Multicultural Education. However, except for Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, the remaining states loosely defined their multicultural requirement. Although Martin's research suggests that many legislators and educators share similar concerns for Multicultural Education and indicates considerable activity going on toward this end, there needs to be much more research done in the area.

Which group concerns are centrally placed in the curricula is much more than a concern for fairness. Preservice curricula should challenge students knowledge and understanding of human diversity in society and how that knowledge is brought into the classroom via institutionalized policies, practices, and procedures, and the knowledge that teachers and students hold about themselves and others. The theoretical perspective used in this study and the two models incorporated in this course challenged students views of human diversity and the knowledge exchanged in the classroom. Preservice curricula should present the lifestyles, contributions, concerns, and accomplishments of all groups in order to challenge preservice teachers' views and understanding of minorities. As Anyon (1983) states:

> The conceptual legitimacy conferred by school knowledge on powerful social groups is metabolized into power that is real when members of society in their everyday decisions support--or fail to challenge--prevailing hierarchies. The idea that certain groups have legitimate social power leads

> to the belief that these groups deserve our support and that contending ones do not. (p. 51)

We as teachers and teacher educators must make it a part of our professional standards to make sure that those contending groups receive our support, and through that support, the chance for a more meaningful education.

References

Anyon, J. (1983). Workers, Labor, and Economic History, and Textbook Content. In M.W. Apple & L. Weis, *Ideology and Practice in Schooling* (pp. 37-60).

Baker, G. (1973). Multicultural Training for Student Teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 24, 306-307.

Baker, G. (1977). Two Preservice Training Approaches. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 28, 31-33.

Banks, James (1987). *Teaching Strategies for Ethnic Studies* . Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, C.T. (1979). The Preparation of Preservice Secondary Social Studies Teachers in Multiethnic Education. *High School Journal*, 62, 232-237.

Corcoran, E. (1982). Classroom Contexts as Settings for Learning to Teach: A New Direction for Research in Teacher Education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 6, 52-55.

Coser, L. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*, New York NY: The Free Press.

Dawson, M. (1981). A Matter of Linkage: Multicultural Education and Educational Equity. In M.E. Dawson et al. (Eds.), *Educational Equity*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, (pp. 1-14).

Doyle, W., & Ponder, G. (1975). Classroom Ecology: Some Concerns About a Neglected Dimension of Research on Teaching. *Contemporary Education*, 46, 183-188.

Gay, Geneva (1975). Organizing and Designing Culturally Pluralistic Curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 33, 176-183.

Giroux, H., and Penna, A. (1979). Social Education in the Classroom: The Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 7(1), 21-42.

Grant, C. (1981). Education That Is Multicultural and Teacher Preparation: An Examination from the Perspectives of Preservice Students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75, 2.

Grant, C. and Koskela R. (1986). Education That is Multicultural and The Relationship Between Preservice Campus Learning and Field Experiences, Journal of Educational Research, 79, 4.

Grant, C. and Sleeter, C. (1986) *After the School Bell Rings*. Philadelphia PA: Falmer Press.

Grant, C., and Sleeter, C. (1988). *Making Choices For Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender*, (CITY): Merrill Publishing Company.

Henington, M. (1981). Effect of Intensive Multicultural, Non-sexist Instruction on Secondary Student Teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 6, 65-75.

Howsam, Robert B., Dean C. Corrigan, et al. (1976). *Educating a Professor.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 108-109.

Mahan, J.M. (1982). Native Americans as Teacher Trainers: Anatomy and Outcomes of a Cultural Immersion Project. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 2,100, 110.

Martin, R., Wood, G., and Stevens, E. (1988). *An Introduction to Teaching: A Quest of Commitment.* Boston MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Martin, R. (1991). Power to Empower: Multicultural Education for Student Teachers. In C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment Through Multicultural Education*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Miller, Richard. (1990) *The Assessment of College Performance.* San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Sims, William E. (1983). Preparing Teachers for Multicultural Classrooms. *Momentum*, 42-44.

Standard for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1976). Washington D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Wesley, C.H. (1949). Education and Democracy. In H.H. Cummings (Ed.), *Improving Human Relations* (pp. 27-31). Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies.